

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
Concord, NH
District of Merrimack NH Docket #
Favorite Things
a DBA
Natasha Athens
v.
Bank of America et al
Megan Scholz
Defendants

PLAINTIFF'S EX-PARTY NOTICE OF APPEAL ON Judge Steven J. McAuliffe's DENIAL of a Motion to Quash Non-Party Motion to Dismiss

The Plaintiff - the only party in this matter due to default and negligence of Thomas Pappas who cannot use anyone in a court to act as "service" failed to ever serve notice of his appearance, nor any pleadings.

Magistrate Judge Johnstone tried to operate as a Defendant and defy judicial oath, and so has Judge McAuliffe. The Motion to Quash was an added "Motion" , another layer of Protection on a defaulted case. There was never any legal way to not serve the Plaintiff, court clerk's do not have service in their duties. Judges are supposed to uphold their oaths, be bi-partisan and rule under the Constitution, a fact that this court does not do - at all. Especially with the Plaintiff, the bias is shown throughout every movement of the Plaintiff's ability to retain lawful forgiveness on an 100% forgivable loan.

Judge McAuliffe is just as compromised as Judge Johnstone, and now has evidence of 3 different amounts on a single loan, and documents that were sealed. The fact that he issued this ruling, after what Judge Johnstone did last week, is beyond fathom, and the question is why are they in "bed" with the bank. It will come out eventually, as now Judge McAuliffe just put his own self on the list of those involved in bank crimes and it's unclear if Judge Johnstone had to "remove herself now" due to pending investigations or the 2nd lawsuit against Thomas Pappas was received this am.

Judge McAuliffe would actually Have ALLOWED a Motion to be quashed when a defaulted party contines to file pleadings and cannot.

This FIX was in, but sadly the parties who never could have prevailed in this case, continue to sit uncomfortably as the Plaintiff is allowed to appeal as an Ex-Party. Should Thomas Pappas continue, even though he defaulted, he will add evidence to his new criminal record, and reasons he needs to lose his bar card.

The court in NH is a deeply rooted cabal, and one can only imagine the frightening skeletons they all have in their judicial chambers.

WHEREFORE, The Plaintiff is serving Notice to the Court that she has appealed this illicit order, the Motion would have to allow for anyone not operating within the electronic filing rules - to not be able to use the system, and for the crime of leaked documents, This judge should have done something to the Defenant attorney, yet nothing for the Plaintiff, despite this crime.

The fact that this motion was denied is moot, since the case is on appeal, and the judge seems to have had to replace Judge Johnstone's ruling. When victims have to appear before these corrupt judges, who defy the rule of law for them, they need to be held to their inability to carry out their duties and be removed.

Also, the Judge did not even explain his illicit ruling, another problem with our justice system, they have to be held to their rulings and when they ignore the law, it's not a Plaintiff that "does not agree" with a ruling, it's that they are too biest to even appear impartial. They display without being called to answer for it.

The CASE is on appeal = ex party, and multiple outlets have the data that this court has allowed for bank fraud, exposure of illicit records, criminal harrassment of Thomas Pappas, failure to serve and use the electronic system, and the court trying to change the laws and rules for that, and they must be flipping out over the next lawsuit, which they have to abide by the electronic rules of filing and the Plaintiff had to write it into case language on her motion for electronic filing, since the court wants to pretend that somehow they can allow for a one party filing/service system that does not

exist, and never will. Any lawful judge would DEMAND 2 part service as the law requires to assure that every single document is served.

They are too corrupt to ever see how this could backfire on someone, and sadly, NH Federal Court uses Sharia law, and has ditched the Constitution long ago, way before the Plaintiff moved to NH.

They "make up rules" as they go along, and change it per case, per Plaintiff and per back door deal. They consider themselves so far above the law that now they forget what is Constitutional and what is legal. It is NOT legal for the court to even attempt to alter the rules of filing and service without legislation. There has never been a document filed so far since electronic service began that tried to make it a one party service, where the court becomes the server, the US Marshall.

It's unclear why moronic Thomas Pappas was stubborn to a fault, the day he signed on, this issue was addressed, and he failed to respond, he failed to file a single document that allowed him to create his own set of rules, and it's only his incredibly twisted connection to judges here that enabled him to continue and file in his pleadings that he was using the court as service and cannot.

Appealed this day, November 22, 2021

FILED WITH THE COURT

THERE is no requirement to serve a non-party and the Plaintiff is not going to enable this continue. Should any non-party try to file pleadings on the appeal, the Plaintiff is seeking additional damages and criminal charges. (already in place, this will just be additional)

Since the Appellate court KNOWS that it's 2 party system - filing and service, they cannot engage or cover for this bank fraud case, and the negligence of Thomas Pappas.

/s/ Natasha Athens

